UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,866	11/12/2003	James McLennan	1529	6734

4518 7590 07/28/2008

ROBERT W. J. USHER
PATENT AGENT
1133 BROADWAY, #1515
NEW YORK, NY 10010

EXAMINER	
DASGUPTA, SOUMYA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/706,866	MCLENNAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SOUMYA DASGUPTA	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 March 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/20/2008, 3/21/2008*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Applicant's Response

In the applicant's response dated 9/13/07, the applicant amended claims 1, 17, and 24 argued against all objections and the rejections.

Currently, claims 1-35 are pending. Claims 1-35 are subject to examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the 3invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.,* 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-2, 7, 17-18, & 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harkins et al (US 5,657,461; Patent Issue Date: Aug 12, 1997; hereafter Harkins) in view of Alam et al (US 6,104,500; Patent Issue Date: Aug 15, 2000; hereafter Alam).

Claim 1:

With respect to claim 1, Harkins teaches a graphical user interface for use in preparation of an automatically generated communication in response to an event requiring generation of a communication, (Figs 2,4-5,7-11).

said communication being generated from a response template which contains data definitions and conditional criteria and wherein conditional criterion in the response template automatically activates alternative selections of text and data according to whether the criterion is met and whether the criterion is not met; (Col 10, lines 58 – col 11, line 20 → Harkins discloses a system that has "communication being generated from a response template which contains data definitions and conditional criteria" in that the user initially selects the default priority of communication. Then, the system then automatically determines the appropriate communication with respect to the priority and the publication type being worked on.)

said graphical user interface comprising: means for presenting an image of a list of at least one selectable operational option; means for accepting selection of at least one operational option from the list; and means for presenting an image of said at least one operational option selected as a chosen option list (Figs 2,4-5,7-11).

said list of said at least one selectable operational option comprises a list of a plurality of different media by which the automatically generated communication can be transmitted; (Fig 11 → Harkins discloses a list of "at least one selectable operational option comprises a list of a plurality of different media" in that there is list of types of communications that can be selected and prioritized by the user.)

and wherein said list of chosen options comprises at least one chosen media for transmission of the automatically generated communication (Col 10, lines 58 – col 11, line 20 → Harkins discloses a system that has "one chosen media for transmission of the automatically generated communication" in that the user initially selects the default priority of communication. Then, the system then automatically determines the appropriate communication with respect to the priority and the publication type being worked on.)

Harkins does not appear to explicitly disclose **the text and data content of the automatically generated communication is automatically changed depending on the characteristic of the chosen media so that differences in text and data content between communications are identifiable by a recipient of a communication.**

Alam discloses **the text and data content of the automatically generated communication is automatically changed depending on the characteristic of the chosen media so that differences in text and data content between communications are identifiable by a recipient of a communication.** (Fig 2 - Fig 3 → Alam discloses "discloses the text and data content of the automatically generated communication is automatically changed depending on the characteristic of the chosen media so that differences in text and data content between communications are identifiable by a recipient of a communication" in that the text and the data of the fax input automatically changes to an email interface.)

Harkins and Alam are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of changing text of different forms of media.

At they time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Harkins and Alam before him or her, to incorporate a system that publishes text with multiple types of outputs, as disclosed by Harkins, with a system that converts faxed inputs to emails, as disclosed by G .

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a system to convert text inputs to multiple types of outputs.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Harkins with Alam to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 2:

With respect to claim 2, Harkins teaches a graphical user interface further comprising: means for selecting a chosen option from the chosen option list; and means for accepting return of a selected chosen option to the list of selectable operational options (Figs 2,4-5, 7-11).

Claim 7:

With respect to claim 7, Harkins teaches a graphical user interface

wherein said graphical user interface comprises means for accepting selection of said at least one chosen media and means for directing the automatically generated communication for transmission on said at least one chosen media selected (Fig. 11).

Claim 17:

Claim 17 corresponds to Claim 1.

Claim 18:

With respect to claim 18, Harkins teaches a method comprising the steps of selecting a chosen option from the chosen option list; and accepting return of the chosen option selected to said list of at least one selectable operational option (Figs 2,4-5, 7-11).

Claim 33:

With respect to claim 33, Harkins teaches a graphical user interface further comprising means to implement the chosen options in subsequent generation of the automatically generated communication (Fig. 4-5, 7-11).

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being taught over Harkins et al (US 5657461 – from hereon will be known as Harkins) in view of Celebiler et al (US 6195094 - from hereon will be known as Celebiler).

Claim 3:

With respect to claim 3, Harkins teaches a graphical user interface wherein said means for presenting an image of a list of at least one selectable operational option and said means for presenting an image of said at least one operational option as a chosen option list (Fig 12A).

Harkins and Alam fail to teach the latter together comprise a split screen, said split screen having a first portion and a second portion and being operative to display said list of said at least one selectable operational option in said first portion and to display said chosen option list in said second portion thereof; a method comprising the steps of providing said first portion of said split screen on a first side thereof and providing said second portion of said split screen on a second side thereof; a method wherein said split screen is one of a plurality of split screens.

Celebiler teaches a split screen, said split screen having a first portion and a second portion and being operative to display said list of said at least one selectable operational option in said first portion and to display said chosen option list in said second portion thereof; a method comprising the steps of providing said first portion of said split screen

on a first side thereof and providing said second portion of said split screen on a second side thereof; a method wherein said split screen is one of a plurality of split screens for the purpose of efficiently using the screen space required to indicate to the user and displaying computer applications in multiple content screens to users by splitting a window of information into several panes (Fig. 3 and Fig. 4).

Harkins, Alam, and Celebiler are analogous because they both teach GUIs with lists and operational options.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harkins and Alam to utilize a split screen to display a list with selectable operations as taught by Celebiler because it allows the user to use a split screen to display a list with operational functions.

Claim 4:

With respect to claim 4, Harkins teach a graphical user interface.

Harkins fails to teach wherein said split screen has a first side and a second side and said first portion of said split screen is on said first side and wherein said second portion of said split screen is on said second side.

Celebiler teaches wherein said split screen has a first side and a second side and said first portion of said split screen is on said first side and wherein said second portion of said split screen is on said second side for the purpose of efficiently using the screen space required to indicate to the user and displaying computer applications in multiple content screens to users by splitting a window of information into several panes. (Fig 4 and Fig 5).

Harkins, Alam, and Celebiler are analogous because they both teach GUIs with lists and operational options.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harkins and Alam to utilize a split screen split screen that has a first side and a second side and said first portion of said split screen is on said first side and wherein said second portion of said split screen is on said second side as taught by Celebiler because split screens enable simultaneous viewing of multiple applications.

Claim 5:

With respect to claim 5, Harkens teach a graphical user interface.

Harkins fail to teach wherein said split screen is one of a plurality of split screens.

Celebiler teach a graphical user interface wherein said split screen is one of a plurality of split screens for the purpose of efficiently using the screen space required to indicate to the user and displaying computer applications in multiple content screens to users by splitting a window of information into several panes (Fig 4).

Harkins, Alam, and Celebiler are analogous because they both teach GUIs with lists and operational options.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harkins and Alam to utilize a split screen wherein said split screen is one of a plurality of split screens as taught by Celebiler because split screens enable simultaneous viewing of multiple applications.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being taught over Harkins et al in view of Makinen et al (US 6826443 - from hereon will be known as Makinen).

Claim 6:

Harkens and Alam fail to teach wherein said list of said at least one selectable operational option is presented as a tree structure.

Makinen teach wherein said list of said at least one selectable operational option is presented as a tree structure for the purpose allowing a hierarchical arrangement of files, folders, and/or directories in a computer (col 4, line 1-7).

Harkens, Alam, and Makinen are analogous because they both teach GUIs with lists and operational options.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harkens and Alam into a list of said at least one selectable operational option is presented as a tree structure as taught by Makinen because it enables a user to search a tree structure for the location of a particular object within the tree structure.

Claims 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being taught over Harkins et al in view of Makinen et al (US 6826443 - from hereon will be known as Makinen) and in further view of Celebiler et al (US 6195094 - from hereon will be known as Celebiler).

Claim 19-21:

With respect to claim 19-21, Harkins, Alam, and Makinen fail to teach a method comprising the steps of providing a split screen with a first portion and a second portion; presenting, simultaneously, an image of a list of said least one selectable operational option in the first portion thereof and an image of said chosen option list in the second portion thereof.

Celebiler teaches a method comprising the steps of providing a split screen with a first portion and a second portion; presenting, simultaneously, an image of a list of said least one selectable operational option in the first portion thereof and an image of said chosen option list in the second portion thereof for the purpose of efficiently using the screen space required to indicate to the user and displaying computer applications in multiple content screens to users by splitting a window of information into several panes (Fig 4).

Harkins, Alam, Makinen, and Celebiler are analogous because they both teach GUIs with lists and operational options.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harkins, Alam, and Makinen to utilize a split screen to display a list with selectable operations as taught by Celebiler because it allows the user to use a split screen to display a list with operational functions.

Claim 22:

With respect to claim 22, Harkens and Alam fails to teach a method comprising the step of presenting said list of at said least one selectable operational option as a tree structure.

Makinen teaches a method comprising the step of presenting said list of at said least one selectable operational option as a tree structure for the purpose allowing a hierarchical arrangement of files, folders, and/or directories in a computer (col 4, line 1-7).

Harkens, Alam, and Makinen are analogous because they both teach GUIs with lists and operational options.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harkens and Alam into a list of said at least one selectable operational option is presented as a tree structure as taught by Makinen because it enables a user to search a tree structure for the location of a particular object within the tree structure (Fig 5 and col 3, line 50-60).

Claim 23:

Harkins and Alam teaches the invention as discussed above.

Harkins also teaches the limitations of claim 23; with respect to the claim, Harkins teaches a method comprising the steps of: accepting selection of said at least one chosen medium; and subsequently directing the automatically generated communication for transmission on said at least one chosen medium (Fig. 11).

Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being taught over Harkins et al in view of AltaVista Babel Fish (from hereon will be known as Babel).

Claims 12-15:

Harkins and Alam teaches the invention as discussed above.

Harkins also teaches the limitations of claims 12-15; with respect to claims, Harkins teaches a graphical user interface wherein said at least one text items comprises items for use in at least one selectable media; a graphical user interface wherein said at least one fixed item comprises at least one selectable place holder for use with at least one media; a graphical user interface wherein said at least one fixed item comprises at least one selectable place holder for use in fixing the position of items with at least one media; a graphical user interface wherein said at least one fixed item comprises at least one selectable item for use with at least one media (Fig. 4-5, 7-11).

Claim 16:

With respect to claim 16, Harkins teaches a graphical user interface comprising means for testing a specified automatically generated communication by presenting different criteria for generation of an automatically generated communication, and means for

altering a specification of the automatically generated communication until an user approved automatically generated communications are obtained (Fig. 4-5, 7-11).

Harkens and Alam fail to teach a graphical user interface comprising conversion means for accepting a criterion definition for each of said at least one criteria and for converting the criterion definition into plain language for display; and a graphical user interface wherein said at least one text item comprises items in a plurality of selectable languages; and a graphical user interface wherein said at least one text item comprises items for use in at least one selectable idioms.

Babel teaches a graphical user interface comprising conversion means for accepting a criterion definition for each of said at least one criteria and for converting the criterion definition into plain language for display; and a graphical user interface wherein said at least one text item comprises items in a plurality of selectable languages; and a graphical user interface wherein said at least one text item comprises items for use in at least one selectable idioms for the purpose of text translation and conversion into languages and idioms (http://www.altavista.com/help/babelfish/babel_help). Note that the examiner interprets idioms to be defined as a language dialect (http://babelfish.altavista.com/).

Harkens, Alam, and Babel are analogous because they both teach GUIs with texts.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harkens with a language conversion as taught by Babel because it creates a GUI with a language translator.

Claims 8-11 and 24-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being taught over Harkins et al in view of Makinen (US 6826443 - from hereon will be known as Makinen) and in further view of Celebiler et al (US 6195094 - from hereon will be known as Celebiler) and in further view of AltaVista Babel Fish (from hereon will be known as Babel).

Claims 8 and 24:

Harkins teaches the invention as discussed above. Harkins also teaches the limitations of claims 8 and 24; with respect to the claim, Harkins teaches a method wherein said list of said at least one selectable operational option comprises at least one of: at least one criterion to be fulfilled to cause the generation of the automatically generated communication; at least one criterion to be fulfilled to select a text item; at least one text item to be selected; and at least one fixed item to be selected (Fig. 11).

Claims 28-32:

Harkins also teaches the limitations of claims 28-32; with respect to the claims, Harkins teaches a method wherein said at least one fixed item comprises at least one selectable place holder for at least one media; said at least one fixed item comprises at

least one selectable place holder for fixing the position of items with at least one media; wherein said at least one fixed item comprises at least one selectable item for at least one media; comprising the steps of: testing a specified automatically generated communication by presenting different criteria for generation of an automatically generated communication thereto; and altering the specification of the automatically generated communication until a satisfactory automatically generated communication is obtained (Fig. 4-5, 7-11).

With respect to claims 8-11 and 24-27, Harkens and Makinen both fail to teach a method comprising the steps of: accepting a criterion definition for each of said at least one criterion and converting the criterion definition into plain language for display; a method wherein said at least one text item comprises items in a plurality of selectable language; a method wherein said at least one text item comprises items for at least one selectable idiom; wherein said at least one text item comprises items for at least one selectable idiom.

Babel teaches a method comprising the steps of: accepting a criterion definition for each of said at least one criterion and converting the criterion definition into plain language for display; a method wherein said at least one text item comprises items in a plurality of selectable language; a method wherein said at least one text item comprises items for at least one selectable idiom for the purpose of text translation and conversion into languages and idioms; wherein said at least one text item comprises

items for at least one selectable idiom. Note that the examiner interprets idioms to be defined as a language dialect (http://babelfish.altavista.com/).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harkins with a language translator as taught by Babel because it creates a GUI with a language translator.

Harkens and Babel are analogous because they both teach GUI's with texts.

Claims 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being taught over Harkins et al in view of Alam et al in view of AltaVista Babel Fish (from hereon will be known as Babel) and in further view of Celebiler et al (US 6195094) and in further view of Makinen et al (US 6826443).

Claim 34:

Harkins also teaches the limitations of claim 34; with respect to the claim, Harkins teaches a graphical user interface for use in preparation of an automatically generated communication in response to an event requiring generation of a communication, said graphical user interface comprising: means for presenting an image of a list of at least one selectable operational option comprising at least one of: at least one criteria to be fulfilled to cause generation of the automatically generated communication; at least one criteria to be fulfilled to select a text item; and at least one fixed item to be selected

comprising at least one selectable place holder for use with at least one medium, at least one selectable place holder for fixing the position of items with at least one medium and at least one selectable item for use with at least one medium; means for accepting selection of an operational option for use; means for presenting an image of said at least one operational option selected as a chosen option list; means for selecting a chosen option on the chosen option list; said list of said at least one selectable operational option comprises a list of a plurality of different media by which the automatically generated communication can be transmitted; said list of chosen options comprises at least one chosen media for transmission of the automatically generated communication; said graphical user interface comprises means for accepting selection of said at least one chosen media and means for directing the automatically generated communication for transmission on said at least one chosen media selected (Fig. 4-5, 7-11).

Harkins does not appear to explicitly disclose **the text and data content of the automatically generated communication is automatically changed depending on the characteristic of the chosen media so that differences in text and data content between communications are identifiable by a recipient of a communication.**

Alam discloses **the text and data content of the automatically generated communication is automatically changed depending on the characteristic of the**

chosen media so that differences in text and data content between communications are identifiable by a recipient of a communication. (Fig 2 - Fig 3 → Alam discloses "discloses the text and data content of the automatically generated communication is automatically changed depending on the characteristic of the chosen media so that differences in text and data content between communications are identifiable by a recipient of a communication" in that the text and the data of the fax input automatically changes to an email interface.)

Harkins and Alam fail to teach at least one text item comprising items in a plurality of selectable languages, items for use in at least one selectable idiom and items for use in at least one selectable medium; conversion means for accepting a criterion definition for each of said at least one criteria and for converting the criterion definition into plain language for display; conversion means for accepting a criterion definition for each of said at least one criteria and for converting the criterion definition into plain language for display.

Babel teaches at least one text item comprising items in a plurality of selectable languages, items for use in at least one selectable idiom and items for use in at least one selectable medium; conversion means for accepting a criterion definition for each of said at least one criteria and for converting the criterion definition into plain language for display; conversion means for accepting a criterion definition for each of said at least one criteria and for converting the criterion definition into plain language for

display for the purpose of text translation and conversion into languages and idioms (http://babelfish.altavista.com/).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harkens with a language translator as taught by Babel because it creates a GUI with a language translator.

Harkins and Babel both fail to teach a means for accepting return of a selected chosen option to the list of selectable operational options, wherein: said means for presenting an image of a list of at least one selectable operational option and said means for presenting an image of said at least one operational option as a chosen option list together comprise a screen split into a first side and a second side and being operative to display said list of said at least one selectable operational option as a tree structure in said first side and to display said chosen option list in said second side thereof.

Celebiler et al (US 6195094) and Makinen (US 6826443) teach a means for accepting return of a selected chosen option to the list of selectable operational options, wherein: said means for presenting an image of a list of at least one selectable operational option and said means for presenting an image of said at least one operational option as a chosen option list together comprise a screen split into a first side and a second side (Celebiler: Fig 4) and being operative to display said list of said at least one selectable operational option as a tree structure in said first side and to

display said chosen option list in said second side thereof for the purpose allowing a hierarchical arrangement of files, folders, and/or directories in a computer (Makinen: col 4, line 1-7 and Fig 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harkins to utilize a split screen to display a list with selectable operations as taught by Celebiler because split screens enable simultaneous viewing of multiple applications and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Harkens into a list of said at least one selectable operational option is presented as a tree structure as taught by Makinen because it enables a user to search a tree structure for the location of a particular object within the tree structure (Fig 5 and col 3, line 50-60).

Harkins, Alam, Makinen, Babelfish, and Celebiler are analogous because they both teach GUIs with lists and operational options.

Claim 35:

Harkins, Alam, Makinen, Babelfish, and Celebiler teach the invention as discussed above.

With respect to the claim 35, Harkins teaches a graphical user interface means for testing a specified automatically generated communication by presenting different criteria for generation of an automatically generated communication, and means for altering a specification of the automatically generated communication until a satisfactory automatically generated communications are obtained (Fig. 4-5, 7-11).

Response to Arguments

Rejection Under 35 USC ~ 102(b) (Claims 1-2, 7, 17-18, & 33):

Applicant's arguments filed for claims 1-2, 7, 17-19, and 33 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant states that in Claims 1 and 17, Harkins does not disclose "the text and data content of the automatically generated communication is automatically changed depending on the characteristic of the chosen media so that differences in text and data content between communications are identifiable by a recipient of a communication." Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1-2, 7, 17-19, and 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim 17-19, and 33 are dependent claims of Claims 1 and 17. Since Claims 1 and 17 are rejected, Claim 17-19, and 33 are also rejected.

Rejection Under 35 USC ~ 103(a) (Claims 3-5, 8-16, 19-23, 24-32, and 34-35):

Applicant's arguments filed for claims 3-5, 8-16, 19-23, 24-32, and 34-35 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant states that in Claim 34, Harkins does not disclose "the text and data content of the automatically generated communication is automatically changed depending on the characteristic of the chosen media so that differences in text and data content between communications are identifiable by a recipient of a communication." Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim 3-5, 8-16, 19-23, 24-32, and 35 are dependent claims of Claims 1, 17, and 34. Since Claims 1, 17, and 34 are rejected, Claim 3-5, 8-16, 19-23, 24-32, and 34-35 are also rejected.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SOUMYA DASGUPTA whose telephone number is (571)272-7432. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9am-7pm, F 9am-1pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

SD